Resource Overbooking and Application Profiling in Shared Hosting Platforms *

Bhuvan Urgaonkar, **Prashant Shenoy** and **Timothy Roscoe**†

Department of Computer Science
University of Massachusetts
Amherst MA 01003
{bhuvan,shenoy}@cs.umass.edu

†Intel Research at Berkeley
2150 Shattuck Avenue Suite 1300
Berkeley CA 94704
troscoe@intel-research.net

Abstract

In this paper, we present techniques for provisioning CPU and network resources in shared hosting platforms running potentially antagonistic third-party applications. The primary contribution of our work is to demonstrate the feasibility and benefits of overbooking resources in shared platforms. Since an accurate estimate of an application's resource needs is necessary when overbooking resources, we present techniques to profile applications on dedicated nodes, possibly while in service, and use these profiles to guide the placement of application components onto shared nodes. We then propose techniques to overbook cluster resources in a controlled fashion such that the platform can provide performance guarantees to applications even when overbooked. We show how our techniques can be combined with commonly used QoS resource allocation mechanisms to provide application isolation and performance guarantees at run-time. We implement our techniques in a Linux cluster and evaluate them using common server applications. We find that the efficiency (and consequently revenue) benefits from controlled overbooking of resources can be dramatic. Specifically, we find that overbooking resources by as little as 1% we can increase the utilization of the cluster by a factor of two, and a 5% overbooking yields a 300-500% improvement, while still providing useful resource guarantees to applications.

1 Introduction and Motivation

Server clusters built using commodity hardware and software are an increasingly attractive alternative to traditional large multiprocessor servers for many applications, in part due to rapid advances in computing technologies and falling hardware prices.

This paper addresses challenges in the design of a particular type of server cluster we call *shared hosting platforms*. These can be contrasted with *dedicated hosting platforms*, where either the entire cluster runs a single application (such as a web search engine), or each individual processing element in the cluster is dedicated to a single application (as in the "managed hosting" services provided by some data centers). In contrast, shared hosting platforms run a large number of different third-party applications (web servers, streaming media servers, multi-player game servers, e-commerce applications, etc.), and the number of applications typically *exceeds the number of nodes in the cluster*. More specifically, each application runs on a subset of the nodes and these subsets can overlap with one another. Whereas dedicated hosting platforms are used for many niche applications that warrant their additional cost, the economic reasons of space, power, cooling and cost make shared hosting platforms an attractive choice for many application hosting environments.

Shared hosting platforms imply a business relationship between the *platform provider* and *application providers*: the latter pay the former for resources on the platform. In return, the platform provider gives some kind of guarantee of resource availability to applications[20].

Perhaps the central challenge in building such a shared hosting platform is resource management: the ability to reserve resources for individual applications, the ability to isolate applications from other misbehaving or overloaded applications, and the ability to provide performance guarantees to applications. Arguably, the widespread deployment of shared hosting platforms has been *hampered* by the lack of effective resource management mechanisms that meet these requirements. Consequently, most hosting platforms in use today adopt one of two approaches.

The first avoids resource sharing altogether by employing a dedicated model. This delivers useful resources to application providers, but is expensive in machine resources. The second approach is to share resources in a best-effort manner among applications, which consequently receive no resource guarantees. While this is cheap in resources, the value delivered to application providers is limited. Consequently, both approaches imply an economic disincentive to deploy viable hosting platforms.

Some recent research efforts have proposed resource management mechanisms for shared hosting platforms [2, 7, 29]. While these efforts take an initial step towards the design of effective shared hosting platforms, many challenges remain to be

---

addressed. This is the context of the present work.

1.1   Research Contributions

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, we show how the resource requirements of an application can be derived using online profiling and modeling. Second, we demonstrate the efficiency benefits to the platform provider of *overbooking* resources on the platform, and how this can be usefully done without adversely impacting the guarantees offered to application providers. Thirdly, we show how untrusted and/or mutually antagonistic applications in the platform can be isolated from one another.

Automatic derivation of QoS requirements

Recent work on resource management mechanisms for clusters (e.g. [2, 29]) implicitly assumes that the resource requirements of an application are either known in advance or can be derived, but does not specifically address the problem of how to determine these requirements. However, the effectiveness of these techniques is crucially dependent on the ability to reserve appropriate amount of resources for each application—overestimating an application's resource needs can result in idling of resources, while underestimating them can degrade application performance.

A shared hosting platform can significantly enhance its utility to users by automatically deriving the QoS requirements of an application. Automatic derivation of QoS requirements involves (i) monitoring an application's resource usage, and (ii) using these statistics to derive QoS requirements that conform to the observed behavior.

In this paper, we employ kernel-based profiling mechanisms to empirically monitor an application's resource usage and propose techniques to derive QoS requirements from this observed behavior. We then use these techniques to experimentally profile several server applications such as web, streaming, game, and database servers. Our results show that the bursty resource usage of server applications makes it feasible to extract statistical multiplexing gains by overbooking resources on the hosting platform.

Revenue maximization through overbooking

The goal of the owner of a hosting platform is to maximize revenue, which implies that the cluster should strive to maximize the number of applications that can be housed on a given hardware configuration. One approach is to *overbook* resources—a technique routinely used to maximize yield in airline reservation systems [24].

Provisioning cluster resources solely based on the worst-case needs of an application results in low average utilization, since the average resource requirements of an application are typically smaller than its worst case (peak) requirements, and resources tend to idle when the application does not utilize its peak reserved share. In contrast, provisioning a cluster based on

a high *percentile* of the application needs yields statistical multiplexing gains that significantly increase the average utilization of the cluster at the expense of a small amount of overbooking, and increases the number of applications that can be supported on a given hardware configuration.

A well-designed hosting platform should be able to provide performance guarantees to applications even when overbooked, with the proviso that this guarantee is now probabilistic instead of deterministic (for instance, an application might be provided a 99% guarantee (0.99 probability) that its resource needs will be met). Since different applications have different tolerance to such overbooking (e.g., the latency requirements of a game server make it less tolerant to violations of performance guarantees than a web server), an overbooking mechanism should take into account diverse application needs.

The primary contribution of this paper is to demonstrate the feasibility and benefits of overbooking resources in shared hosting platforms. We propose techniques to overbook (i.e. under-provision) resources in a controlled fashion based on application resource needs. Although such overbooking can result in transient overloads where the aggregate resource demand temporarily exceeds capacity, our techniques limit the chances of transient overload of resources to predictably rare occasions, and provide useful performance guarantees to applications in the presence of overbooking.

The techniques we describe are general enough to work with many commonly used OS resource allocation mechanisms. Experimental results demonstrate that overbooking resources by amounts as small as 1% yields a factor of two increase in the number of applications supported by a given platform configuration, while a 5-10% overbooking yields a 300-500% increase in effective platform capacity. In general, we find that the more bursty the application resource needs, the higher are the benefits of resource overbooking. We also find that collocating CPU-bound and network-bound applications as well as bursty and non-bursty applications yields additional multiplexing gains when overbooking resources.

Placement and isolation of antagonistic applications

In a shared hosting platform, it is assumed that third-party applications may be antagonistic to each other and/or the platform itself, either through malice or bugs. A hosting platform should address these issues by isolating applications from one another and preventing malicious, misbehaving, or overloaded applications from affecting the performance of other applications.

A third contribution of our work is to demonstrate how untrusted third-party applications can be isolated from one another in shared hosting platforms. This isolation takes two forms. Local to a machine, each processing node in the platform employs resource management techniques that "sandbox" applications by restricting the resources consumed by an application to its reserved share. Globally, the process of placement, whereby components of an application are assigned to individual processing nodes, can be constrained by externally imposed policies—for instance, by risk assessments made by

Figure 1: Architecture of a shared hosting platform. Each application runs on one or more nodes and shares resources with other applications.

the provider about each application, which may prevent an application from being collocated with certain other applications. Since a manual placement of applications onto nodes is infeasibly complex in large clusters, the design of automated placement techniques that allow a platform provider to exert sufficient control over the placement process is a key issue.

1.2 System Model and Terminology

The shared hosting platform assumed in our research consists of a cluster of N *nodes*, each of which consists of processor, memory, and storage resources as well as one or more network interfaces. Platform nodes are allowed to be heterogeneous with different amounts of these resources on each node. The nodes in the hosting platform are assumed to be interconnected by a high-speed LAN such as gigabit ethernet (see Figure 1). Each cluster node is assumed to run an operating system kernel that supports some notion of quality of service such as reservations or shares. Such mechanisms have been extensively studied over the past decade and many deployed commercial and open-source operating systems such as Solaris [26], IRIX [22], Linux [27], and FreeBSD [5] already support such features. In this paper, we primarily focus on managing two resources—CPU and network interface bandwidth—in shared hosting platforms. The challenges of managing other resources in hosting environments, such as memory and storage, are beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, we believe the techniques developed here are also applicable to these other resources.

We use the term *application* for a complete service running on behalf of an application provider; since an application will frequently consist of multiple distributed components, we use the term *capsule* (borrowed from [13]) to refer to that component of an application running on a single node. Each application has at least one capsule, possibly more if the application is distributed. Capsules provide a useful abstraction for logically partitioning an application into sub-components and for exerting control over the distribution of these components onto different nodes. To illustrate, consider an e-commerce application consisting of a web server, a Java application server and a database server. If all three components need to be collocated

on a single node, then the application will consist of a single capsule with all three components. On the other hand, if each component needs to be placed on a different node, then the application should be partitioned into three capsules. Depending on the number of its capsules, each application runs on a subset of the platform nodes and these subsets can overlap with one another, resulting in resource sharing (see Figure 1).

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses techniques for empirically deriving an application's resource needs, while Section 3 discusses our resource overbooking techniques and capsule placement strategies. We discuss implementation issues in Section 4 and present our experimental results in Section 5. Section 6 discusses related work, and finally, Section 7 presents concluding remarks.

2 Automatic Derivation of Application QoS Requirements

The first step in hosting a new application is to derive its resource requirements. While the problem of QoS-aware resource management has been studied extensively in the literature [4, 8, 14, 15], the problem of *how much* resource to allocate to each application has received relatively little attention. In this section, we address this issue by proposing techniques to automatically derive the QoS requirements of an application (the terms resource requirements and QoS requirements are used interchangeably in this paper.) Deriving the QoS requirements is a two step process: (i) we first use profiling techniques to monitor application behavior, and (ii) we then use our empirical measurements to derive QoS requirements that conform to the observed behavior.

2.1 Application QoS Requirements: Definitions

The QoS requirements of an application are defined on a per-capsule basis. For each capsule, the QoS requirements specify the intrinsic rate of resource usage, the variability in the resource usage, the time period over which the capsule desires resource guarantees, and the level of overbooking that the application (capsule) is willing to tolerate. As explained earlier, in this paper, we are concerned with two key resources, namely CPU and network interface bandwidth. For each of these resources, we define the QoS requirements along the above dimensions in an OS-independent manner. In Section 4.1, we show how to map these requirements to various OS-specific resource management mechanisms that have been developed.

More formally, we represent the QoS requirements of an application capsule by a quintuple $(\sigma, \rho, \tau, U, O)$:

- *Token Bucket Parameters* (σ, ρ): We capture the basic resource requirements of a capsule by modeling resource usage as a token bucket (σ, ρ) [28]. The parameter σ denotes the intrinsic rate of resource consumption, while ρ denotes the variability in the resource consumption. More specifically, σ denotes the rate at which the capsule consumes CPU cycles or network interface bandwidth, while

ρ captures the maximum burst size. By definition, a token bucket bounds the resource usage of the capsule to $\sigma \cdot t + \rho$ over any interval t.

- *Period τ:* The third parameter τ denotes the time period over which the capsule desires guarantees on resource availability. Put another way, the system should strive to meet the QoS requirements of the capsule over each interval of length τ. The smaller the value of τ, the more stringent are the desired guarantees (since the capsule needs to be guaranteed resources over a finer time scale). In particular, for the above token bucket parameters, the capsule requires that it be allocated at least $\sigma \cdot \tau + \rho$ resources every τ time units.

- *Usage Distribution U:* While the token bucket parameters succinctly capture the capsule's resource requirements, they are not sufficiently expressive by themselves to denote the QoS requirements in the presence of overbooking. Consequently, we use two additional parameters—U and O—to specify resource requirements in the presence of overbooking. The first parameter U denotes the probability distribution of resource usage. Note that U is a more detailed specification of resource usage than the token bucket parameters (σ, ρ), and indicates the probability with which the capsule is likely to use a certain fraction of the resource (i.e., $U(x)$ is the probability that the capsule uses a fraction x of the resource, $0 \le x \le 1$). A probability distribution of resource usage is necessary so that the hosting platform can provide (quantifiable) probabilistic guarantees even in the presence of overbooking.

- *Overbooking Tolerance O:* The parameter O is the overbooking tolerance of the capsule. It specifies the probability with which the capsule's requirements may be violated due to resource overbooking (by providing it with less resources than the required amount). Thus, the overbooking tolerance indicates the minimum level of service that is acceptable to the capsule. To illustrate, if $O = 0.01$, the capsule's resource requirements should be met 99% of the time (or with a probability of 0.99 in each interval τ).

In general, we assume that parameters τ and O are specified by the application provider. This may be based on a contract between the platform provider and the application provider (e.g., the more the application provider is willing to pay for resources, the stronger are the provided guarantees), or on the particular characteristics of the application (e.g., a streaming media server requires more stringent guarantees and is less tolerant to violations of these guarantees). In the rest of this section, we show how to derive the remaining three parameters σ, ρ and U using profiling, given values of τ and O.

2.2 Kernel-based Profiling of Resource Usage

Our techniques for empirically deriving the QoS requirements of an application rely on profiling mechanisms that monitor application behavior. Recently, a number of application profiling mechanisms ranging from OS-kernel-based profiling [1] to runtime profiling using specially linked libraries [23] have been proposed.

We use kernel-based profiling mechanisms in the context of shared hosting platforms, for a number of reasons. Firstly, being kernel-based, these mechanisms work with any application and require no changes to the application at the source or binary levels. This is especially important in hosting environments where the platform provider may have little or no access to third-party applications. Secondly, accurate estimation of an application's resource needs requires detailed information about when and how much resources are used by the application at a fine time-scale. Whereas detailed resource allocation information is difficult to obtain using application-level techniques, kernel-based techniques can provide precise information about various kernel events such as CPU scheduling instances and network packet transmissions times.

The profiling process involves running the application on a set of isolated platform nodes (the number of nodes required for profiling depends on the number of capsules). By isolated, we mean that each node runs only the minimum number of system services necessary for executing the application and no other applications are run on these nodes during the profiling process—such isolation is necessary to minimize interference from unrelated tasks when determining the application's resource usage. The application is then subjected to a realistic workload, and the kernel profiling mechanism is used to track its resource usage. It is important to emphasize that the workload used during profiling should be both realistic and representative of real-world workloads. While techniques for generating such realistic workloads are orthogonal to our current research, we note that a number of different workload-generation techniques exist, ranging from trace replay of actual workloads to running the application in a "live" setting, and from the use of synthetic workload generators to the use of well-known benchmarks. Any such technique suffices for our purpose as long as it realistically emulates real-world conditions, although we note that, from a business perspective, running the application "for real" on an isolated machine to obtain a profile may be preferable to other workload generations techniques.

We use the Linux trace toolkit as our kernel profiling mechanism [16]. The toolkit provides flexible, low-overhead mechanisms to trace a variety of kernel events such as system call invocations, process, memory, file system and network operations. The user can specify the specific kernel events of interest as well as the processes that are being profiled to selectively log events. For our purposes, it is sufficient to monitor CPU and network activity of capsule processes—we monitor CPU scheduling instances (the time instants at which capsule processes get scheduled and the corresponding quantum durations) as well as network transmission times and packet sizes. Given such a trace of CPU and network activity, we now discuss the derivation of the capsule's QoS requirements.

Figure 2: An example of an On-Off trace.

(a) Usage distribution   (b) Token bucket parameters

Figure 3: Derivation of the usage distribution and token bucket parameters.

2.3 Empirical Derivation of the QoS Requirements

We use the trace of kernel events obtained from the profiling process to model CPU and network activity as a simple On-Off process. This is achieved by examining the time at which each event occurs and its duration and deriving a sequence of busy (On) and idle (Off) periods from this information (see Figure 2). This trace of busy and idle periods can then be used to derive both the resource usage distribution U as well as the token bucket parameters (σ, ρ).

Determining the usage distribution U: Recall that, the usage distribution U denotes the probability with which the capsule uses a certain fraction of the resource. To derive U, we simply partition the trace into measurement intervals of length $\mathcal{I}$ and measure the fraction of time for which the capsule was busy in each such interval. This value, which represents the fractional resource usage in that interval, is histogrammed and then each bucket is normalized with respect to the number of measurement intervals $\mathcal{I}$ in the trace to obtain the probability distribution U. Figure 3(a) illustrates this process.

Deriving token bucket parameters (σ, ρ): Recall that a token bucket limits the resource usage of a capsule to $\sigma \cdot t + \rho$ over any interval t. A given On-Off trace can have, in general, many (σ, ρ) pairs that satisfy this bound. To intuitively understand why, let us compute the cumulative resource usage for the capsule over time. The cumulative resource usage is simply the total resource consumption thus far and is computed by incrementing the cumulative usage after each ON period. Thus, the cumulative resource usage is a step function as depicted in Figure 3(b).

Our objective is to find a line $\sigma \cdot t + \rho$ that bounds the cumulative resource usage; the slope of this line is the token bucket rate σ and its Y-intercept is the burst size ρ. As shown in Figure 3(b), there are in general many such curves, all of which are valid descriptions of the observed resource usage.

Several algorithms that mechanically compute all valid (σ, ρ) pairs for a given On-Off trace have been proposed recently. We use a variant of one such algorithm [28] in our research—for each On-Off trace, the algorithm produces a range of σ values (i.e., $[\sigma_{min}, \sigma_{max}]$) that constitute valid token bucket rates for observed behavior. For each σ within this range, the algorithm also computes the corresponding burst size ρ. Although any pair within this range conforms to the observed behavior, the choice of a particular (σ, ρ) has important practical implications.

Since the overbooking tolerance O for the capsule is given, we can use O to choose a particular (σ, ρ) pair. To illustrate, if $O = 0.05$, the capsule needs must be met 95% of the time, which can be achieved by reserving resources corresponding to the 95th percentile of the usage distribution. Consequently, a good policy for shared hosting platforms is to *pick a σ that corresponds to the $(1-O) * 100^{th}$ percentile of the resource usage distribution U,* and to pick the corresponding ρ as computed by the above algorithm. This ensures that we provision resources based on a high percentile of the capsule's needs and that this percentile is chosen based on the specified overbooking tolerance O.

2.4 Profiling Server Applications: Experimental Results

In this section, we profile several commonly-used server applications to illustrate the process of deriving an application's QoS requirements. Our experimentally derived profiles not only illustrate the inherent nature of various server application but also demonstrate the utility and benefits of resource overbooking in shared hosting platforms.

The test bed for our profiling experiments consists of a cluster of five Dell Poweredge 1550 servers, each with a 966 MHz Pentium III processor and 512 MB memory running Red Hat Linux 7.0. All servers runs the 2.2.17 version of the Linux kernel patched with the Linux trace toolkit version 0.9.5, and are connected by 100Mbps Ethernet links to a Dell PowerConnect (model no. 5012) ethernet switch.

To profile an application, we run it on one of our servers and use the remaining servers to generate the workload for profiling. We assume that all machines are lightly loaded and that all non-essential system services (e.g., mail services, X windows server) are turned off to prevent interference during profiling. We profile the following server applications in our experiments:

- *Apache web server:* We use the SPECWeb99 benchmark [25] to generate the workload for the Apache web server (version 1.3.24). The SPECWeb benchmark allows control along two dimensions—the number of concurrent clients and the percentage of dynamic (cgi-bin) HTTP requests.

(a) Probability distribution (PDF) (b) Cumulative distribution function (CDF) (c) Token bucket parameters

Figure 4: Profile of the Apache web server using the default SPECWeb99 configuration.

We vary both parameters to study their impact on Apache's resource needs.

- *MPEG streaming media server:* We use a home-grown streaming server to stream MPEG-1 video files to multiple concurrent clients over UDP. Each client in our experiment requests a 15 minute long variable bit rate MPEG-1 video with a mean bit rate of 1.5 Mb/s. We vary the number of concurrent clients and study its impact on the resource usage at the server.

- *Quake game server:* We use the publicly available Linux Quake server to understand the resource usage of a multi-player game server; our experiments use the standard version of Quake I—a popular multi-player game on the Internet. The client workload is generated using a bot—an autonomous software program that emulates a human player. We use the publicly available "terminator" bot to emulate each player; we vary the number of concurrent players connected to the server and study its impact on the resource usage.

- *PostgreSQL database server:* We profile the postgreSQL database server (version 7.2.1) using the *pgbench 1.2* benchmark. This benchmark is part of the postgreSQL distribution and emulates the TPC-B transactional benchmark [19]. The benchmark provides control over the number of concurrent clients as well as the number of transactions performed by each client. We vary both parameters and study their impact on the resource usage of the database server.

We now present some results from our profiling study.

Figure 4(a) depicts the CPU usage distribution of the Apache web server obtained using the default settings of the SPECWeb99 benchmark (50 concurrent clients, 30% dynamic cgi-bin requests). Figure 4(b) plots the corresponding cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the resource usage. As shown in the figure (and summarized in Table 1), the worst case CPU usage (100th profile) is 25% of CPU capacity. Further, the 99th and the 95th percentiles of CPU usage are 10

and 4% of capacity, respectively. These results indicate that CPU usage is bursty in nature and that the worst-case requirements are significantly higher than a high percentile of the usage. Consequently, under provisioning (i.e., overbooking) by a mere 1% reduces the CPU requirements of Apache by a factor of 2.5, while overbooking by 5% yields a factor of 6.25 reduction (implying that 2.5 and 6.25 times as many web servers can be supported when provisioning based on the 99th and 95th percentiles, respectively, instead of the 100th profile). Thus, even small amounts of overbooking can potentially yield significant increases in platform capacity. Figure 4(c) depicts the possible valid (σ, ρ) pairs for Apache's CPU usage. Depending on the specified overbooking tolerance O, we can set σ to an appropriate percentile of the usage distribution U, and the corresponding ρ can then be chosen using this figure.

Figures 5(a)-(d) depict the CPU or network bandwidth distributions, as appropriate, for various server applications. Specifically, the figure shows the usage distribution for the Apache web server with 50% dynamic SPECWeb requests, the streaming media server with 20 concurrent clients, the Quake game server with 4 clients and the postgreSQL server with 10 clients. Table 1 summarizes our results and also presents profiles for several additional scenarios (only a small subset of the three dozen profiles obtained from our experiments are presented due to space constraints). Table 1 also lists the worst-case resource needs as well as the 99th and the 95th percentile of the resource usage.

Together, Figure 5 and Table 1 demonstrate that all server applications exhibit burstiness in their resource usage, albeit to different degrees. This burstiness causes the worst-case resource needs to be significantly higher than a high percentile of the usage distribution. Consequently, we find that the 99th percentile is smaller by a factor of 1.1-2.5, while the 95th percentile yields a factor of 1.3-6.25 reduction when compared to the 100th percentile. Together, these results illustrate the potential gains that can be realized by overbooking resources in shared hosting platforms.

6

(a) Apache: dynamic requests

(b) Streaming media server

(c) Quake Server

(d) PostgreSQL Server

Figure 5: Profiles of Various Server Applications

Application	Resource	Res. usage at percentile			(σ, ρ)
		100th	99th	95th	for $O = 0.01$
WS,default	CPU	0.25	0.10	0.04	(0.10, 0.218)
WS, 50% dynamic	CPU	0.69	0.29	0.12	(0.29, 0.382)
SMS,k=4	Net	0.19	0.16	0.11	(0.16, 1.89)
SMS,k=20	Net	0.63	0.49	0.43	(0.49, 6.27)
GS,k=2	CPU	0.011	0.010	0.009	(0.010, 0.00099)
GS,k=4	CPU	0.018	0.016	0.014	(0.016, 0.00163)
DBS,k=1 (def)	CPU	0.33	0.27	0.20	(0.27, 0.184)
DBS,k=10	CPU	0.85	0.81	0.79	(0.81, 0.130)

Table 1: Summary of profiles. Although we profiled both CPU and network usage for each application, we only present results for the more constraining resource due to space constraints. Abbreviations: WS=Apache, SMS=streaming media server, GS=Quake game server, DBS=database server, k=num. clients.

3 Resource Overbooking and Capsule Placement in Hosting Platforms

Having derived the QoS requirements of each capsule, the next step is to determine which platform node will run each capsule. Several considerations arise when making such placement decisions. First, since platform resources are being overbooked, the platform should ensure that the QoS requirements of a capsule will be met even in the presence of overbooking. Second, since multiple nodes may have the resources necessary to house each application capsule, the platform will need to pick a specific mapping from the set of feasible mappings. This choice will be constrained by issues such as trust among competing applications. In this section, we present techniques for overbooking platform resources in a controlled manner. The aim is to ensure that: (i) the QoS requirements of the application are satisfied and (ii) overbooking tolerances as well as external policy constraints are taken into account while making placement decisions.

3.1 Resource Overbooking Techniques

A platform node can accept a new application capsule so long as the resource requirements of existing capsules are not violated, and sufficient unused resources exist to meet the requirements of the new capsule. However, if the node resources are overbooked, another requirement is added: the overbooking tolerances of individual capsules already placed on the node should not be exceeded as a result of accepting the new capsule. Verifying these conditions involves two tests:

Test 1: Resource requirements of the new and existing capsules can be met. To verify that a node can meet the requirements of all capsules, we simply sum the requirements of individual capsules and ensure that the aggregate requirements do not exceed node capacity. For each capsule i on the node, the QoS parameters (σ_i, ρ_i) and τ_i require that the capsule be allocated $(\sigma_i \cdot \tau_i + \rho_i)$ resources in each interval of duration τ_i. Further, since the capsule has an overbooking tolerance O_i, in the worst case, the node can allocate only $(\sigma_i \cdot \tau_i + \rho_i) * (1 - O_i)$ resources and yet satisfy the capsule needs (thus, the overbooking tolerance represents the fraction by which the allocation may be reduced if the node saturates due to overbooking). Consequently, even in the worst case scenario, the resource requirements of all capsules can be met so long as the total resource requirements do not exceed the capacity:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (\sigma_i \cdot \tau_{min} + \rho_i) \cdot (1 - O_i) \leq C \cdot \tau_{min} \qquad (1)$$

where C denotes the CPU or network interface capacity on the node, k denotes the number of existing capsules on the node, $k + 1$ is the new capsule, and $\tau_{min} = \min(\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots \tau_{k+1})$ is the period τ for the capsule that desires the most stringent guarantees.

Test 2: Overbooking tolerances of all capsules are met. The overbooking tolerance of a capsule is met only if the total amount of overbooking is smaller than its specified tolerance. To compute the aggregate overbooking on a node, we must first compute the total resource usage on the node. Since the usage distributions U_i of individual capsules are known, the total resource on a node is simply the sum of the individual usages. That is, $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} U_i$, where Y denotes the of aggregate resource usage distribution on the node. Assuming each U_i is independent, the resulting distribution Y can be computed from elementary probability theory.[1] Given the total resource usage distribution Y, the probability that the total demand exceeds the

---

[1]This is done using the z-transform. The z-transform of a random variable U is the polynomial $Z(U) = a_0 + za_1 + z^2 a_2 + \cdots$ where the coefficient of the ith term represents the probability that the random variable equals i (i.e., $U(i)$). If $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_{k+1}$ are $k + 1$ independent random variables,

Figure 6: A bipartite graph indicating which capsules can be placed on which nodes

node capacity should be less than the overbooking tolerance for every capsule, that is,

$$Pr(Y > C) \leq O_i \ \ \forall i \quad (2)$$

where C denotes the CPU or network capacity on the node. Rather than verifying this condition for each individual capsule, it suffices to do so for the least-tolerance capsule. That is,

$$Pr(Y > C) \leq \min(O_1, O_2, \ldots, O_{k+1}) \quad (3)$$

where $Pr(Y > C) = \sum_{x=C}^{\infty} Y(x)$. Note that Equation 3 enables a platform to provide a probabilistic guarantee that a capsule's QoS requirements will be met at least $(1 - O_{min}) \times 100\%$ of the time.

Equations 1 and 3 can easily handle heterogeneity in nodes by using appropriate C values for the CPU and network capacities on each node.

A new capsule can be placed on a node if Equations 1 and 3 are satisfied for both the CPU and network interface. Since multiple nodes may satisfy a capsule's CPU and network requirements, especially at low and moderate utilizations, we need to devise policies to choose a node from the set of all feasible nodes for the capsule. We discuss this issue next.

3.2 Capsule Placement Algorithms

Consider an application with m capsules that needs to be placed on the shared hosting platform with N nodes. For each of the m capsules, we can determine the set of *feasible* platform nodes. A feasible node is one that can satisfy the capsule's resource requirements (i.e., satisfies Equations 1 and 3 for both the CPU and network requirements). The platform must then pick a feasible node for each capsule such that all m capsules can be placed on the platform, with the constraint that no two capsules can be placed on the same node (since, by definition, two capsules from the same application are not collocated).

The placement of capsules onto nodes subject to the above constraint can be handled as follows. We model the placement problem using a graph that contains a vertex for each of the m capsules and N nodes. We add an edge from a capsule to a node if that node is a feasible node for the capsule (i.e.,

and $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} U_i$, then $Z(Y) = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} Z(U_i)$. The distribution of Y can then be computed using a polynomial multiplication of the z-transforms of $U_1, U_2, \cdots, U_{k+1}$ [18].

has sufficient resources to house the application). The result is a bipartite graph where each edges connects a capsule to a node. Figure 6 illustrates such a graph with three capsules and four nodes. As shown in the figure, determining an appropriate placement is a non-trivial problem since the placement decision for one capsule can impact the placement of other capsules. In the above figure, for instance, placing either capsule 2 or 3 onto node 3 eliminates any possible placement for capsule 1 (which has node 3 as its only feasible node). Multiple such constraints may exist, all of which will need to be taken into account when determining the final placement.

Given such a graph, we use the following algorithm to determine a placement. The algorithm starts with the capsule that is most constrained (i.e., has the least number of edges/feasible nodes) and places it on any one of its feasible nodes (this node can be chosen randomly). The node and all of its edges are deleted (since no other capsule can be placed on it). The algorithm then picks the next most constrained capsule and repeats the above process until all m capsules are placed onto nodes. In Figure 6, for instance, such an algorithm would first attempt to place capsule 1 and then capsules 3 and 2. By considering more constrained capsules first, the algorithm maximizes the chances of finding a placement for all m capsules. In fact, it can be shown that such a greedy algorithm will *always find a placement if one exists*. In Lemma 1 we formally state and prove this property of any such algorithm. Further, the algorithm is efficient, since capsules can be placed in a single linear scan once they are sorted in the increasing order of out-degree, resulting in an overall complexity of $O(m \cdot \log m)$.

Lemma 1 *Any placement algorithm that considers capsules in a non-decreasing order of their out-degrees (or equivalently, in a non-decreasing order of the sizes of their feasible sets) will find a placement if one exists.*

Proof: First, we state without proof the following obvious invariant that is necessary and sufficient for there to be a feasible placement of a set of capsules on a given set of nodes. We denote this invariant by $\mathcal{P}$.

$\mathcal{P}$: Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of capsules and $\mathcal{N}$ denote the set of nodes. Let $FS(C)$ represent the set of nodes feasible for the set of capsules C. For any non-null subset of $\mathcal{C}$, call it C, the following must hold:

$$\mid C \mid \leq \mid FS(C) \mid \quad (4)$$

Let us examine any placement algorithm that considers capsules in a non-decreasing order of their out-degrees. Assume that there is at least one valid placement of the capsules $\mathcal{C}$ on the nodes $\mathcal{N}$. As already alluded to, the placement algorithm proceeds in *stages* — in each stage, it picks from the set of unplaced capsules a capsule with the smallest out-degree and places it on any of its feasible nodes that is still free. Since exactly one capsule gets placed in each stage, an algorithm that places all the capsules comprises $\mid C \mid$ stages. We denote these by $s_0, \ldots s_{\mid C \mid - 1}$.

We claim that for an algorithm that behaves in the above manner, if the invariant $\mathcal{P}$ holds before any stage, then it also

holds after it. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}$ holds to start with because of our assumption of the existence of atleast one valid placement. Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ holds before a stage s_i, $0 < i \leq | C | -1$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_{rem}$ the set of capsules remaining to be placed and by $\mathcal{N}_{rem}$ the set of nodes that are free before stage s_i. Let $c_{smallest}$ be the capsule that our algorithm picks from $\mathcal{C}_{rem}$ in stage s_i and places it one of its feasible nodes. Note that our assumption that $\mathcal{P}$ holds before stage s_i guarantees that there would be atleast one node where $c_{smallest}$ may be placed. Let our algorithm place $c_{smallest}$ on n^* making n^* an infeasible node for the remaining capsules. For any capsule in $\mathcal{C}_{rem} - c_{smallest}$, the size of the feasible set goes down by atmost 1 due to the placement of $c_{smallest}$ on n^*. Also, for no capsule does the feasible set become null because $\mathcal{P}$ holds for $(\mathcal{C}_{rem}, \mathcal{N}_{rem})$, and the degree of any capsule is $\geq$ the degree of $c_{smallest}$ due to the way our algorithm works. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}$ holds after stage s_i. This proves our lemma.

∎

Whereas the above algorithm randomly picks a node for a capsule when multiple feasible nodes exist, as we will show in Sec. 5.2, the choice of a particular feasible node can have important implications of the total number of applications supported by the cluster. Consequently, we consider three other policies, in addition to random, for making this decision. The first policy is best-fit, where we choose the feasible node which has the least unused resources (i.e., constitutes the best fit for the capsule). The second policy is worst-fit, where we place the capsule onto the feasible node with the most unused resources. In general, the unused network and CPU capacities on a node may be different, and similarly, the capsule may request different amounts of CPU and network resources. Consequently, defining the best and worst fits for the capsule must take into account the unused capacities on *both* resources—we currently do so by simply considering the mean unused capacity across the two resources and compare it to the mean requirements across the two resources to determine the "fit".

A third policy is to place a capsule onto a node that has other capsules with similar overbooking tolerances. Since a node must always meet the requirements of its least tolerant capsule per Equation 3, collocating capsules with similar overbooking tolerances permits the platform provider to maximize the amount of resource overbooking in the platform. For instance, placing a capsule with a tolerance of 0.01 onto a node that has an existing capsule with $O = 0.05$ reduces the maximum permissible overbooking on that node to 1% (since $O_{min} = \min(0.01, 0.05) = 0.01$). On the other hand, placing this less-tolerant capsule on another node may allow future, more tolerant capsules to be placed onto this node, thereby allowing nodes resources to be overbooked to a greater extent. We experimentally compare the effectiveness of these three policies in Section 5.2.

3.3 Policy Constraints on Capsule Placement

Whereas the strategies outlined in the previous section take QoS requirements into account while making placement decisions,

they do not consider externally imposed policies which might constrain placement. For example, a platform provider might refuse to collocate capsules from applications owned by competing providers. Alternatively, the decision as to whether to collocate application capsules might be a quantitative one, involving some model of risk assessment.

To capture these notions, we quantify the "trust" between a newly arriving application and the existing k applications using a trust vector $< T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k >$. Essentially, the vector specifies trust between applications in a pair-wise fashion; the ith element of the vector, T_i, denotes the trust between the new application and application i. T_i can vary between 0 and 1 depending on the level of trust between the two applications—a value of 0 indicates no trust whatsoever, a 1 indicates complete trust, and intermediate values indicate varying degrees of trust. A application capsule should not be collocated with a capsule with $T_i = 0$. In general, application capsules should be placed on nodes containing capsules with larger trust values.

The policies outlined in the previous section can be modified to account for this notion of potentially antagonistic applications (as determined by an external policy). To do so, we enhance the bipartite graph with a weight on each edge. The weight of an edge is the trust value of the least trust-worthy application capsule on that node and the current application. Edges with a weight 0 are deleted. Given the resulting bipartite graph, we need to pick a placement that attempts to maximize the sum of the weights of the chosen edges (which ensures that capsules get placed onto nodes running applications that are trusted to a greater extent). The resulting placement decisions are driven by two considerations: (i) metrics such as best-fit, worst-fit or the overbooking tolerance (which impacts the effective platform capacity), and (ii) the weight of the edges (which determines the level of trust between collocated capsules). Such decisions can be made by computing a weighted sum of the two metrics—namely the nature of the "fit" and the weight of the edge—and picking a feasible node with the maximum weighted sum. Thus, we can ensure that external policy constraints are taken into account when making placement decisions.

4 Implementation Considerations

In this section, we first discuss implementation issues in integrating our resource overbooking techniques with OS resource allocation mechanisms. We then present an overview of our prototype implementation.

4.1 Providing Application Isolation at Run Time

The techniques described in the previous section allow a platform provider to overbook platform resources and yet provide guarantees that the QoS requirements of applications will be met. The task of enforcing these guarantees at run-time is the responsibility of the OS kernel. To meet these guarantees, we assume that the kernel employs resources allocation mechanisms that support some notion of quality of service. Numer-

ous such mechanisms—such as reservations, shares and token bucket regulators [4, 8, 14, 15]—have been proposed recently. All of these mechanisms allow a certain fraction of each resource (CPU cycles, network interface bandwidth) to be reserved for each application and enforce these allocations on a fine time scale.

In addition to enforcing the QoS requirements of each application, these mechanisms also isolate applications from one another. By limiting the resources consumed by each application to its reserved amount, the mechanisms prevent a malicious or overloaded application from grabbing more than its allocated share of resources, thereby providing application isolation at run-time—an important requirement in shared hosting environments running untrusted applications.

Our overbooking techniques can exploit many commonly used QoS-aware resource allocation mechanisms. Since the QoS requirements of an application are defined in a OS- and mechanism-independent manner, we need to map these OS-independent QoS requirements to mechanism-specific parameter values. We outline these mappings for three commonly-used QoS-aware mechanisms.

CPU reservations: A reservation-based CPU scheduler [14, 15] requires the CPU requirements to be specified as a pair (x, y) where the capsule desires x units of CPU time every y time units (effectively, the capsule requests $\frac{x}{y}$ fraction of the CPU). For reasons of feasibility, the sum of the requests allocations should not exceed 1 (i.e., $\sum_j \frac{x_j}{y_j} \leq 1$). In such a scenario, the QoS requirements of a capsule with token bucket parameters (σ_i, ρ_i) and an overbooking tolerance O_i can be translated to CPU reservation by setting $(1 - O_i) \cdot \sigma_i = \frac{x_i}{y_i}$ and $(1 - O_i) \cdot \rho_i = x_i$. To see why, recall that $(1 - O_i) \cdot \sigma_i$ denotes the rate of resource consumption of the capsule in the presence of overbooking, which is same as $\frac{x_i}{y_i}$. Further, since the capsule can request x_i units of the CPU every y_i time units, and in the worst case, the entire x_i units may be requested continuously, we set the burst size to be $(1 - O_i) \cdot \rho_i = x_i$. These equations simplify to $x_i = (1 - O_i) \cdot \rho_i$ and $y_i = \rho_i / \sigma_i$.

Proportional-share and lottery schedulers: Proportional-share and lottery schedulers [8, 11, 32] enable resources to be allocated in relative terms—in either case, a capsule is assigned a weight w_i (or w_i lottery tickets) causing the scheduler to allocate $w_i \sum_j w_j$ fraction of the resource. Further, two capsules with weights w_i and w_j are allocated resources in proportion to their weights ($w_i : w_j$). For such schedulers, the QoS requirements of a capsule can be translated to a weight by setting $w_i = (1 - O_i) \cdot \sigma_i$. By virtue of using a single parameter w_i to specify the resource requirements, such schedulers ignore the burstiness ρ in the resource requirements. Consequently, the underlying scheduler will only approximate the desired QoS requirements. The nature of approximation depends on the exact scheduling algorithm—the finer the time-scale of the allocation supported by the scheduler, the better will the actual allocation approximate the desired requirements.

Rate regulators: Rate regulators are commonly used to police the network interface bandwidth used by an application. Such regulators limit the sending rate of the application based on a specified profile. A commonly used regulator is the token bucket regulator that limits the amount of bytes transmitted by an application to $\sigma \cdot t + \rho$ over any interval t. Since we model resource usage of a capsule as a token bucket, the QoS requirements of a capsule trivially map to an actual token bucket regulator and no special translation is necessary.

4.2 Prototype Implementation

We have implemented a Linux-based shared hosting platform that incorporates the techniques discussed in the previous sections.[2] Our implementation consists of three key components: (i) a profiling module that allows us to profile applications and empirically derive their QoS requirements, (ii) a control plane that is responsible for resource overbooking and capsule placement, and (iii) a QoS-enhanced Linux kernel that is responsible for enforcing application QoS requirements.

The profiling module runs on a set of dedicated (and therefore isolated) platform nodes and consists of a vanilla Linux kernel enhanced with the Linux trace toolkit. As explained in Section 2, the profiling module gathers a kernel trace of CPU and network activities of each capsule. It then post-processes this information to derive an On-Off trace of resource usage and then derives the usage distribution U and the token bucket parameters for this usage.

The control plane is responsible for placing capsules of newly arriving applications onto nodes while overbooking node resources. The control plane also keeps state consisting of a list of all capsules residing on each node and their QoS requirements. It also maintains information about the hardware characteristics of each node. The requirements of a newly arriving application are specified to the control plane using a resource specification language. This specification includes the CPU and network bandwidth requirements of each capsule and the trust vector. The control plane uses this specification to derive a placement for each capsule as discussed in Section 3.2. In addition to assigning each capsule to a node, the control plane also translates the QoS parameters of the capsules to parameters of commonly used resource allocation mechanisms (discussed in the previous section).

The third component, namely the QoS-enhanced Linux kernel, runs on each platform node and is responsible for enforcing the QoS requirements of capsules at run time. We choose Linux over other operating system kernels since a number of QoS-aware resource allocation mechanisms have already been implemented in Linux, allowing us to experiment with these mechanisms. For the purposes of this paper, we implement the H-SFQ proportional-share CPU scheduler [11]. H-SFQ is a *hierarchical* proportional-share scheduler that allows us to group resource principals (processes, lightweight processes) and assign an aggregate CPU share to the entire group. This functionality is essential since a capsule contains all processes of an application that are collocated on a node and the QoS requirements are specified for the capsule as a whole rather than

---

[2]Source code for our prototype will be publicly released in early summer. Interested readers may contact the authors for an early pre-release version.

for individual resource principals. To implement such an abstraction, we create a separate node in the H-SFQ scheduling hierarchy for each capsule, and attach all resource principals belonging to a capsule to this node. The node is then assigned a weight (determined using the capsule's QoS requirements) and the CPU allocation of the capsule is shared by all resource principals of the capsule.[3] We implement a token bucket regulator to provide QoS guarantees at the network interface card. Our rate regulator allows us to associate all network sockets belonging to a group of processes to a single token bucket. We instantiate a token bucket regulator for each capsule and regulate the network bandwidth usage of all resource principals contained in this capsule using the (σ, ρ) parameters of the capsule's network bandwidth usage. In Section 5.3, we experimentally demonstrate the efficacy of these mechanisms in enforcing the QoS requirements of capsules even in the presence of overbooking. While we have experimented with other resource allocation mechanisms such as reservations [15] and have found that overbooking techniques indeed work well with other commonly used mechanisms, we omit here the results obtained using these other mechanisms due to space constraints.

5 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we present the results of our experimental evaluation. The setup used in our experiments is identical to that described in Section 2.4—we employ a cluster of Linux-based servers as our shared hosting platform. Each server runs a QoS-enhanced Linux kernel consisting of the H-SFQ CPU scheduler and a leaky bucket regulator for the network interface. The control plane for the shared platform implements the resource overbooking and capsule placement strategies discussed earlier in this paper. For ease of comparison, we use the same set of applications discussed in 2.4 and their derived profiles (see Table 1) for our experimental study.

5.1 Efficacy of Resource Overbooking

Our first experiment examines the efficacy of overbooking resources in shared *web hosting* platforms—a type of shared hosting platform that runs only web servers. Each web server running on the platform is assumed to conform to one of the four web server profiles gathered from our profiling study (two of these profiles are shown in Table 1; the other two employed varying mixes of static and dynamic SPECweb99 requests). The objective of our experiment is to examine how many such web servers can be supported by a given platform configuration for various overbooking tolerances. We vary the overbooking tolerance from 0% to 10%, and for each tolerance value, attempt to place as many web servers as possible until the platform resources are exhausted. We first perform the experiment for a cluster of 5 nodes (identical to our hardware configuration) and then repeat it for cluster sizes ranging from 16 to 128 nodes

[3]The use of the scheduling hierarchy to further multiplex capsule resources among resource principals in a controlled way is clearly feasible but beyond the scope of this paper

Figure 7: Benefits of resource overbooking in a web hosting platform.

(since we lack clusters of these sizes, for these experiments, we only examine how many applications can be accommodated on the platform and do not actually run these applications). Figure 7 depicts our results with 95% confidence intervals. The figure shows that, the larger the amount of overbooking, the larger is the number of web servers that can be run on a given platform. Specifically, for a 128 node platform, the number of web servers that can be supported increases from 307 when no overbooking is employed to over 1800 for 10% overbooking (a factor of 5.9 increase). Even for a modest 1% overbooking, we see a factor of 2 increase in the number of web servers that can be supported on platforms of various sizes. Thus, even modest amounts of overbooking can significantly enhance revenues for the platform provider.

Next, we examine the benefits of overbooking resources in a shared hosting platform that runs a mix of streaming servers, database servers and web servers. To demonstrate the impact of burstiness on overbooking, we first focus only on the streaming media server. As shown in Table 1, the streaming server (with 20 clients) exhibits less burstiness a typical web server, and consequently, we expect smaller gains due to resource overbooking. To quantify these gains, we vary the platform size from 5 to 128 nodes and determine the number of streaming servers that can be supported with 0%, 1% and 5% overbooking. Figure 8(a) plots our results with 95% confidence intervals. As shown, the number of servers that can be supported increases by 30-40% with 1% overbooking when compared to the no overbooking case. Increasing the amount of overbooking from 1% to 5% yields only a marginal additional gain, consistent with the profile for this streaming server shown in Table 1 (and also indicative of the less-tolerant nature of this soft real-time application). Thus, less bursty applications yield smaller gains when overbooking resources.

Although the streaming server does not exhibit significant burstiness, large statistical multiplexing gains can still accrue by collocating bursty and non-bursty applications. Further, since streaming server is heavily network-bound and uses a minimal amount of CPU, additional gains are possible by collocating applications with different bottleneck resources (e.g., CPU-bound and network-bound applications). To examine the

11

(a) Streaming media servers   (b) Mix of applications

Figure 8: Benefits of resource overbooking for a less bursty streaming server application and for application mixes.

validity of this assertion, we conduct an experiment where we attempt to place a mix of streaming, web and database servers—a mix of CPU-bound and network-bound as well as bursty and non-bursty applications. Figure 8(b) plots the number of applications supported by platforms of different sizes with 1% overbooking. As shown, an identical platform configuration is able to support a large number of applications than the scenario where only streaming servers are placed on the platform. Specifically, for a 32 node cluster, the platform supports 36 and 52 additional web and database servers in addition to the approximately 80 streaming servers that were supported earlier. We note that our capsule placement algorithms are automatically able to extract these gains without any specific "tweaking" on our part. Thus, collocating applications with different bottleneck resources and different amounts of burstiness enhance additional statistical multiplexing benefits when overbooking resources.

5.2 Capsule Placement Algorithms

Our next experiment compares the effectiveness of the best-fit, worst-fit and random placement algorithms discussed in Section 3.2. Using our profiles, we construct two types of applications: a replicated web server and an e-commerce application consisting of a front-end web server and a back-end database server. Each arriving application belongs to one of these two categories and is assumed to consist of 2-10 capsules, depending on the degree of replication. The overbooking tolerance is set to 5%. We then determine the number of applications that can be placed on a given platform by different placement strategies. Figure 9(a) depicts our results. As shown, best-fit and random placement yield similar performance, while worst-fit outperforms these two policies across a range of platform sizes. This is because best-fit places capsules onto nodes with smaller unused capacity, resulting in "fragmentation" of unused capacity on a node; the leftover capacity may be wasted if no additional applications can be accommodated. Worst fit, on the other hand, reduces the chances of such fragmentation by placing capsules onto nodes with the larger unused capacity. While such effects become prominent when application capsules have

widely varying requirements (as observed in this experiment), they become less noticeable when the application have similar resource requirements. To demonstrate this behavior, we attempted to place Quake game servers onto platforms of various sizes. Observe from Table 1 that the game server profiles exhibit less diversity than a mix of web and database servers. Figure 9(b) shows that, due to the similarity in the application resource requirements, all policies are able to place a comparable number of game servers.

Finally, we examine the effectiveness of taking the overbooking tolerance into account when making placement decisions. We compare the worst-fit policy to an overbooking-conscious worst-fit policy. The latter policy chooses the three worst-fits among all feasible nodes and picks the node that best matches the overbooking tolerance of the capsule. Our experiment assumes a web hosting platform with two types of applications: less-tolerant web servers that permit 1% overbooking and more tolerant web servers that permit 10% overbooking. We vary the platform size and examine the total number of applications placed by the two policies. As shown in Figure 9(c), taking overbooking tolerances into account when making placement decisions can help increase the number of applications placed on the cluster. However, we find that the additional gains are small ($< 6\%$ in all cases), indicating that a simple worst-fit policy may suffice for most scenarios.

5.3 Effectiveness of Kernel Resource Allocation Mechanisms

While our experiments thus far have focused on the impact of overbooking on platform capacity, in our next experiment, we examine the impact of overbooking on application performance. We show that combining our overbooking techniques with kernel-based QoS resource allocation mechanisms can indeed provide application isolation and quantitative performance guarantees to applications (even in the presence of overbooking). We begin by running the Apache web server on a dedicated (isolated) node and examine its performance (by measuring throughput in requests/s) for the default SPECWeb99 workload. We then run the web server on a node running our QoS-

(a) Placing diverse applications　　(b) Placing similar applications　　(c) Overbooking-conscious placement

Figure 9: Performance of various capsule placement strategies.

Application	Metric	Isolated Node	100th	99th	95th	Average
Apache	Throughput (req/s)	67.93 ± 2.08	67.51 ± 2.12	66.91 ± 2.76	64.81 ± 2.54	39.82 ± 5.26
PostgreSQL	Throughput (transactions/s)	22.84 ± 0.54	22.46 ± 0.46	22.21 ± 0.63	21.78 ± 0.51	9.04 ± 85
Streaming	Length of violations (sec)	0	0	0.31 ± 0.04	0.59 ± 0.05	5.23 ± 0.22

Table 2: Effectiveness of kernel resource allocation mechanisms. All results are shown with 95% confidence intervals.

enhanced Linux kernel. We first allocate resources based on the 100th percentile of its usage (no overbooking) and assign the remaining capacity to a greedy *dhrystone* application (this application performs compute-intensive integer computations and greedily consumes all resources allocated to it). We measure the throughput of the web server in presence of this background dhrystone application. Next, we reserve resources for the web server based on the 99th and the 95th percentiles, allocate the remaining capacity to the dhrystone application, and measure the server throughput. Table 2 depicts our results. As shown, provisioning based on the 100th percentile yields performance that is comparable to running the application on an dedicated node. Provisioning based on the 99th and 95th percentiles results in a small degradation in throughput, but well within the permissible limits of 1% and 5% degradation, respectively, due to overbooking. Table 2 also shows that provisioning based on the *average* resource requirements results in a substantial fall in throughout, indicating that reserving resources based on mean usage is not advisable for shared hosting platforms.

We repeat the above experiment for the streaming server and the database server. The background load for the streaming server experiment is generated using a greedy UDP sender that transmits network packets as fast as possible, while that in case of the database server is generated using the dhrystone applications. In both cases, we first run the application on an isolated node and then on our QoS-enhanced kernel with provisioning based on the 100th, 99th and the 95th percentiles. We measure the throughput in transaction/s for the database server and the mean length of a playback violation (in seconds) for the streaming media server. Table 2 plots our results. Like in the web server, provisioning based on the 100th percentile yields performance comparable to running the application on an isolated node, while small amounts of overbooking results in a

(a) CDF on isolated node　　(b) CDF on overbooked node

Figure 10: Effect of overbooking on the PostgreSQL server CPU profile.

corresponding small amount of degradation in application performance.

For each of the above scenarios, we also computed the application profiles in the presence of background load and overbooking and compared it to the profiles gathered on the isolated node. Figure 10 shows one such pair and compares the profile of the database server on the isolated node with that obtained with background load and 1% overbooking. As can be seen, the two profiles look similar, indicating that the presence of background load does not interfere with the application behavior, and hence, the profiles obtained by running the application on an isolated node are representative of the behavior on an overbooked node (for a given workload).

Together, these results demonstrate that our kernel resource allocation mechanisms are able to successfully isolate applications from one another and are able to provide quantitative performance guarantees even when resources are overbooked.

6 Related Work

Research on clustered environments over the past decade has spanned a number of issues. Systems such as Condor have investigated techniques for harvesting idle CPU cycles on a cluster of workstations to run batch jobs [17]. The design of scalable, fault-tolerant network services running on server clusters has been studied in [9]. Use of virtual clusters to manage resources and contain faults in large multiprocessor systems has been studied in [10]. Scalability, availability and performance issues in dedicated clusters have been studied in the context of clustered mail servers [21] and replicated web servers [2]. Ongoing efforts in the grid computing community have focused on developing standard interfaces for resource reservations in clustered environments [12].

In the context of QoS-aware resource allocation, numerous efforts over the past decade have developed predictable resource allocation mechanisms for single machine environments [4, 8, 14, 15]. Such techniques form the building block for resource allocation in clustered environments. The specific problem of QoS-aware resource management for clustered environments has been investigated in [2, 3]. Both efforts build upon single node QoS-aware resource allocation mechanisms and propose techniques to extend their benefits to clustered environments. Provisioning resources in hosting centers based on energy considerations has studied in [7]. The technique uses an economic approach for sharing resources in such environments and is driven by energy considerations. In contrast, our work focuses on maximizing revenue by overbooking resources. Statistical admission control techniques that overbook resources have been studied in the context of video-on-demand servers [31] and ATM networks [6]. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to consider resource overbooking in context of shared hosting platforms (i.e., clustered environments).

7 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we presented techniques for provisioning CPU and network resources in shared hosting platforms running potentially antagonistic third-party applications. We argued that provisioning resources solely based on the worst-case needs of applications results in low average utilization, while provisioning based on a high percentile of the application needs can yield statistical multiplexing gains that significantly increase the utilization of the cluster. Since an accurate estimate of an application's resource needs is necessary when provisioning resources, we presented techniques to profile applications on dedicated nodes, possibly while in service, and used these profiles to guide the placement of application components onto shared nodes. We then proposed techniques to overbook cluster resources in a controlled fashion such that the platform can provide performance guarantees to applications even when overbooked. Our techniques, in conjunction with commonly used OS resource allocation mechanisms, can provide application isolation and performance guarantees at run-time in the presence of overbooking. We implemented our techniques in a Linux cluster and evaluated them using common server applications. We found that the efficiency benefits from controlled overbooking of resources can be dramatic. Specifically, overbooking resources by as little as 1% increases the utilization of the hosting platform by a factor of 2, while overbooking by 5-10% results in gains of up to 500%. The more bursty the application resources needs, the higher are the benefits of resource overbooking. More generally, our results demonstrate the benefits and feasibility of overbooking resources for the platform provider.

References

[1] J. Anderson, L. Berc, J. Dean, S. Ghemawat, M. Henzinger, S. Lueng, M. Vandervoorde, C. Waldspurger, and W. Weihl. Continuous Profiling: Where Have All the Cycles Gone? In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 1–14, October 1997.

[2] M. Aron, P. Druschel, and W. Zwaenepoel. Cluster Reserves: A Mechanism for Resource Management in Cluster-based Network Servers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMETRICS Conference, Santa Clara, CA*, June 2000.

[3] A. Arpaci-Dusseau and D E. Culler. Extending Proportional-Share Scheduling to a Network of Workstations. In *Proceedings of Parallel and Distributed Processing Techniques and Applications (PDPTA'97), Las Vegas, NV*, June 1997.

[4] G. Banga, P. Druschel, and J. Mogul. Resource Containers: A New Facility for Resource Management in Server Systems. In *Proceedings of the third Symposium on Operating System Design and Implementation (OSDI'99), New Orleans*, pages 45–58, February 1999.

[5] J. Blanquer, J. Bruno, M. McShea, B. Ozden, A. Silberschatz, and A. Singh. Resource Management for QoS in Eclipse/BSD. In *Proceedings of the FreeBSD'99 Conference, Berkeley, CA*, October 1999.

[6] R. Boorstyn, A. Burchard, J. Liebeherr, and C. Oottamakorn. Statistical Service Assurances for Traffic Scheduling Algorithms. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 18(12):2651–2664, December 2000.

[7] J. Chase, D. Anderson, P. Thakar, A. Vahdat, and R. Doyle. Managing Energy and Server Resources in Hosting Centers. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, pages 103–116, October 2001.

[8] K. Duda and D. Cheriton. Borrowed Virtual Time (BVT) Scheduling: Supporting Lantency-sensitive Threads in a General-Purpose Scheduler. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP'99), Kiawah Island Resort, SC*, pages 261–276, December 1999.

[9] A. Fox, S. D. Gribble, Y. Chawathe, E. A. Brewer, and P. Gauthier. Cluster-based Scalable Network Services. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth ACM symposium on Operating systems principles (SOSP'97), Saint-Malo, France*, pages 78–91, December 1997.

[10] K. Govil, D. Teodosiu, Y. Huang, and M. Rosenblum. Cellular Disco: Resource Management using Virtual Clusters on Shared-memory Multiprocessors. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP'99), Kiawah Island Resort, SC*, pages 154–169, December 1999.

[11] P. Goyal, X. Guo, and H.M. Vin. A Hierarchical CPU Scheduler for Multimedia Operating Systems. In *Proceedings of Operating System Design and Implementation (OSDI'96), Seattle*, pages 107–122, October 1996.

[12] Global Grid Forum: Scheduling and Resource Management Working Group. http://www-unix.mcs.anl.gov/ schopf/ggf-sched, 2002.

[13] Open Distributed Processing – Reference Model: Overview. Recommendation X.901, International Telecommunication Union, March 1997.

[14] M B. Jones, D Rosu, and M Rosu. CPU Reservations and Time Constraints: Efficient, Predictable Scheduling of Independent Activities. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth ACM symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP'97), Saint-Malo, France*, pages 198–211, December 1997.

[15] I. Leslie, D. McAuley, R. Black, T. Roscoe, P. Barham, D. Evers, R. Fairbairns, and E. Hyden. The Design and Implementation of an Operating System to Support Distributed Multimedia Applications. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communication*, 14(7):1280–1297, September 1996.

[16] Linux Trace Toolkit Project Page. http://www.opersys.com/LTT/, 2002.

[17] M. Litzkow, M. Livny, and M. Mutka. Condor - A Hunter of Idle Workstations. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference of Distributed Computing Systems*, pages 104–111, June 1988.

[18] A. Papoulis. *Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes*. McGraw Hill, 1991.

[19] *The pgbench man page, PostgreSQL software distribution*, 2002.

[20] T. Roscoe and B. Lyles. Distributing Computing without DPEs: Design Considerations for Public Computing Platforms. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGOPS European Workshop, Kolding, Denmark*, September 2000.

[21] Y. Saito, B. Bershad, and H. Levy. Manageability, Availability and Performance in Porcupine: A Highly Available, Scalable Cluster-based Mail Service. In *Proceedings of the 17th SOSP, Kiawah Island Resort, SC*, pages 1–15, December 1999.

[22] REACT: IRIX Real-time Extensions. Silicon Graphics, Inc., http://www.sgi.com/software/react, 1999.

[23] S. Shende, A. D. Malony, J. Cuny, K. Lindlan, P. Beckman, and S. Karmesin. Portable Profiling and Tracing for Parallel Scientific Applications using C++. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGMETRICS Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Tools (SPDT)*, pages 134–145, Aug 1998.

[24] B C. Smith, J F. Leimkuhler, and R M. Darrow. Yield Management at American Airlines. *Interfaces*, 22(1):8–31, January-February 1992.

[25] The Standard Performance Evaluation Corporation (SPEC), http://www.spec.org. *SPECWeb99 Benchmark Documentation*.

[26] Solaris Resource Manager 1.0: Controlling System Resources Effectively. Sun Microsystems, Inc., http://www.sun.com/software/whitepapers/wp-srm/, 1998.

[27] V Sundaram, A. Chandra, P. Goyal, P. Shenoy, J Sahni, and H Vin. Application Performance in the QLinux Multimedia Operating System. In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM Conference on Multimedia, Los Angeles, CA*, November 2000.

[28] P. Tang and T. Tai. Network Traffic Characterization Using Token Bucket Model. In *Proceedings of IEEE Infocom'99, New York, NY*, March 1999.

[29] B. Urgaonkar and P. Shenoy. Sharc: Managing CPU and Network Bandwidth in Shared Clusters. Technical Report TR01-08, Department of Computer Science, University of Massachusetts, October 2001.

[30] B. Urgaonkar, P. Shenoy, and T. Roscoe. Resource Overbooking and Application Profiling in Shared Hosting Platforms. Technical report, Department of Computer Science, University of Massachusetts, May 2002.

[31] H. M. Vin, P. Goyal, A. Goyal, and A. Goyal. A Statistical Admission Control Algorithm for Multimedia Servers. In *Proceedings of the ACM Multimedia'94, San Francisco*, pages 33–40, October 1994.

[32] C. A. Waldspurger and W. E. Weihl. Lottery Scheduling: Flexible Proportional-share Resource Management. In *Proceedings of symposim on Operating System Design and Implementation*, November 1994.